UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/729,426	12/05/2000	Yoshinori Nagata	1035-295	6474

23117 7590 02/24/2006

NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

EXAMINER	
MENBERU, BENIYAM	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2626	

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/729,426	NAGATA, YOSHINORI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Beniyam Menberu	2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *01 February 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-12,21 and 23-32* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-12,21 and 23-32* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

2. Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed February 1, 2006, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1, 21, 25, and 27 under U.S. Patent No. 6661933 to Hisatomi et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6424429 to Takahashi et al and claims 23 and 24 under U.S. Patent No. 6661933 to Hisatomi et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6424429 to Takahashi et al further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5293256 to Fukushima et al further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6560704 to Dieterman et al, and claim have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of U.S. Patent No. 6128102 to Ota and U.S. Patent No. 5313572 to Yamamoto et al.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3, 4, 21, 25, 26, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6661933 to Hisatomi et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6128102 to Ota.

Regarding claim 1, Hisatomi et al disclose a document management device (Figure 1, reference 103), comprising:

a memory section for storing a document which has an identification number (Figure 1, reference 105; column 8, lines 17-32);

an input section for receiving an image including the identification number of the document which has the identification number (Figure 1, reference 102; column 13, lines 55-64);

a control section comprising an extracting section for extracting the identification number from the image received by the input section (Figure 1, reference 101b; column 21, lines 24-34),

a document obtaining section which uses the extracted identification number to search for and obtain from among documents in the memory section the document which has the identification number (Figure 1, reference 103), and

an output section for outputting the document obtained by the document obtaining section (Figure 1, reference 109; column 10, lines 38-50). However Hisatomi et al does not disclose an input section for receiving an image including the summary information, a judging section for judging whether the extracted summary information is correct with respect to the document obtained by the document obtaining section, and an output

section for outputting the documents when the judging section judges the extracted summary information to be correct.

Ota discloses an input section for receiving an image including the summary information, a judging section for judging whether the extracted summary information is correct with respect to the document obtained by the document obtaining section, and an output section for outputting the documents when the judging section judges the extracted summary information to be correct (column 6, lines 22-44).

Hisatomi et al and Ota are combinable because they are in the similar problem area of document processing.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the image retrieval system of Ota with the document retrieval system of Hisatomi et al to implement retrieval of files using image summary information and identification.

The motivation to combine the reference is clear because Ota teaches that using keyword/title to retrieve is not efficient method for image retrieval (column 1, lines 19-44).

Regarding claim 3, Hisatomi et al in view of Ota teach all the limitations of claim 1. Further Ota disclose document management device as set forth in claim 1, wherein: the summary information comprises at least a partial image (column 7, lines 50-60; Figure 7a), and when an image which coincides with the extracted summary information section exists in the document obtained by the document obtaining section, the judging section judges the extracted summary information to be correct (column 6, lines 30-39).

Regarding claim 4, Hisatomi et al in view of Ota teach all the limitations of claim 1. Further Hisatomi et al disclose the document management device as set forth in claim 1, wherein, when the document obtaining section fails to obtain the document which has the identification number, the output section provides an output indicative of the absence of the corresponding document in the memory section (Figure 3, reference s132; column 9, lines 56-67; column 10, lines 32-67; column 11, lines 1-10).

Regarding claim 21, Hisatomi et al in view of Ota disclose a recording medium which stores a document management program which is used in a computer system to implement the process performed by the device of claim 1 (Hisatomi et al: column 10, lines 62-65).

Regarding claim 25, Hisatomi et al disclose a document management device, comprising:

a memory section for storing documents each of which has an identification number (Hisatomi et al : Figure 1, reference 105; column 8, lines 17-32);

an input section for receiving an image including an identification number identifying a requested document (Hisatomi et al : Figure 1, reference 102; column 13, lines 55-64)

an output section (Hisatomi et al: Figure 1, reference 109; column 10, lines 38-50);

a control section comprising an extracting section for extracting the identification number of the requested document from the image received by the input section (Hisatomi et al: Figure 1, reference 101b; column 21, lines 24-34), a document obtaining section which retrieves from the memory section a document whose identification

number corresponds to the extracted identification number (Hisatomi et al: Figure 1, reference 103; column 10, lines 39-46). However Hisatomi et al does not disclose an input section for receiving an image including the summary information of the requested document, extracting section for extracting summary information of the requested document, and a judging section which uses the extracted summary information to determine whether to output the retrieved document via the output section.

Ota discloses an input section for receiving an image including the summary information of the requested document, extracting section for extracting summary information of the requested document, and a judging section which uses the extracted summary information to determine whether to output the retrieved document via the output section (column 6, lines 22-44).

Hisatomi et al and Ota are combinable because they are in the similar problem area of document processing.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the image retrieval system of Ota with the document retrieval system of Hisatomi et al to implement retrieval of files using image summary information and identification.

The motivation to combine the reference is clear because Ota teaches that using keyword/title to retrieve is not efficient method for image retrieval (column 1, lines 19-44).

Regarding claim 26, Hisatomi et al in view of Ota teach all the limitations of claim 25. Further Ota disclose the document management device as set forth in claim 25,

wherein: the summary information comprises an image (column 7, lines 50-60; Figure 7a).

Regarding claim 32, Hisatomi et al in view of Ota teach all the limitations of claim 25. Further Hisatomi et al in view of Ota disclose the document management device as set forth in claim 25, wherein the image received by the input section comprises an image of a document request form on which the identification number (Figure 27; column 23, lines 45-65; column 24, lines 16-25) and the summary information are printed (Ota: column 6, lines 22-28).

5. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6661933 to Hisatomi et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6128102 to Ota further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6424429 to Takahashi et al.

Regarding claim 2, Hisatomi et al in view of Ota teach all the limitations of claim 1. However Hisatomi et al in view of Ota does not disclose the document management device as set forth in claim 1, wherein:

the image received by the input section is transmitted from an external device via a communications network, and the output section transmits the output document to the external device.

Takahashi et al disclose the document management device as set forth in claim 1, wherein:

the image received by the input section is transmitted from an external device via a communications network, and the output section transmits the output document to the external device (Figure 1; column 11, lines 28-42).

Hisatomi et al, Ota, and Takahashi et al are combinable because they are in the similar problem area of document processing.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the remote document processing of Takahashi et al with the system of Hisatomi et al in view of Ota to implement remote retrieval of document data.

The motivation to combine the reference is clear because it would be convenient for a user to request document remotely when the user is not at the location where the document is filed.

6. Claims 5-12 and 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6661933 to Hisatomi et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6128102 to Ota further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6628412 to Jeran et al.

Regarding claim 5, Hisatomi et al in view of Ota teach all the limitations of claim 1. However Hisatomi et al in view of Ota does not disclose the document management device as set forth in claim 1, wherein the image received by the input section includes information indicative of a version of the document which has the identification number.

Jeran et al disclose the document management device as set forth in claim 1, wherein the image received by the input section includes information indicative of a version of the document which has the identification number (The system of Jeran et al disclose a method wherein the version number of a document is printed on a document so that the version number can be scanner and used for tracking of the document (column 2, lines 58-66). Thus version number information can be appended to the input image using the teachings of Jeran et al.).

Hisatomi et al, Ota, and Jeran et al are combinable because they are in the similar problem area of document processing.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the version information taught by Jeran et al with the document system of Hisatomi et al in view of Ota to implement version based document retrieval.

The motivation to combine the reference is clear because it would be convenient to retrieve documents by version number if there are many copies of the original document.

Regarding claim 6, Hisatomi et al in view of Ota teach all the limitations of claim 1. Further Jeran et al disclose the document management device as set forth in claim 1, wherein the memory section stores one or more additional documents each of which has the identification number and a different version (Jeran et al: column 3, lines 34-41; Since Hisatomi et al use identification for documents, the combination of Hisatomi et al in view of Takahashi et al and Jeran et al can generate documents with multiple versions of a document with an identification number.).

Regarding claim 7, Hisatomi et al in view of Ota further in view of Jeran et al teach all the limitations of claim 6. Further Hisatomi et al in view of Ota further in view of Jeran et al disclose the document management device as set forth in claim 6, wherein: the control section judges a presence or absence of a predetermined mark in the image received by the input section (Jeran et al: column 3, lines 30-35), and when the control section judges the presence of the predetermined mark in the image received by the

input section, the output section outputs the document having a latest version out of the documents (Jeran et al: column 6, lines 8-21) obtained by the document obtaining section which have the identification number (Hisatomi et al: Figure 1, reference 109; column 10, lines 38-50).

Regarding claim 8, Hisatomi et al in view of Ota further in view of Jeran et al teach all the limitations of claim 6. Further Hisatomi et al in view of Ota further in view of Jeran et al disclose the document management device as set forth in claim 6, wherein: the control section judges a presence or absence of version information in the image received by the input section, and when the control section judges the presence of the version information in the image received by the input section, the output section outputs the document having a version designated by the version information out of the documents (Jeran et al: column 2, lines 61-65; column 3, lines 30-35; column 6, lines 10-17) obtained by the document obtaining section which have the identification number (Hisatomi et al: Figure 1, reference 103; column 10, lines 39-47: Thus Hisatomi et al in view of Ota further in view of Jeran et al can provide documents using identification number and version information.).

Regarding claim 9, Hisatomi et al in view of Ota teach all the limitations of claim 1. Hisatomi et al in view of Ota further in view of Jeran et al disclose the document management device as set forth in claim 1, wherein:
the control section further includes an approval section for judging a presence or absence of correct approval information in the image received by the input section, and when the approval section judges the absence of the correct approval information in the

image received by the input section, output from the output section is prohibited (Jeran et al disclose a machine-code that is printed on document that can be used for authorization purpose (column 4, lines 66-67, column 5, lines 1-9); Hisatomi et al also prohibits print out of image file when decoding of ID (which reads on approval information) fails as shown in Figure 3, steps s126, s130-s132 wherein the print out step s129 is not executed when decode fails.).

Regarding claim 10, Hisatomi et al in view of Ota further in view of Jeran et al teach all the limitations of claim 9. Further Jeran et al disclose the document management device as set forth in claim 9, wherein each document which is stored in the memory section includes the approval information (Jeran et al disclose a processor that can compare authorization information with information present on database (column 5, lines 13-18) which implies that the database has comparable information to the authorization information).

Regarding claim 11, Hisatomi et al in view of Ota further in view of Jeran et al teach all the limitations of claim 9. Further Jeran et al disclose the document management device as set forth in claim 9, wherein, when the image received by the input section includes predetermined information together with the approval information output from the output section is prohibited (Jeran et al disclose that identification code entered by user will be inputted together with data from machine-code on the scanned document to determine whether user is authorized to generate output on the system (column 5, lines 8-18)).

Regarding claim 12, Hisatomi et al in view of Ota further in view of Jeran et al teach all the limitations of claim 9. Further Hisatomi et al disclose the document management device as set forth in claim 9, wherein, when the approval section judges the absence of the correct approval information in the image received by the input section, the output section provides an output indicative of the absence of the correct approval information (Hisatomi et al: Figure 3, s130-s132; column 10, lines 51-67; column 11, lines 1-15).

Regarding claim 28, Hisatomi et al in view of Ota teach all the limitations of claim 25. Further Jeran et al discloses the document management device as set forth in claim 25, wherein the documents stored in the memory section comprise different versions of one or more of the documents, the different versions having the same identification number, but different version information (Jeran et al: column 3, lines 34-41; Since Hisatomi et al use identification for documents, the combination of Hisatomi et al in view of Takahashi et al and Jeran et al can generate documents with multiple versions of a document with an identification number).

Regarding claim 29, Hisatomi et al in view of Ota further in view of Jeran et al teach all the limitations of claim 28. Further Jeran et al disclose the document management device as set forth in claim 28, wherein:

the control section determines a presence or absence of a predetermined mark in the image received by the input section (Jeran et al: column 3, lines 30-35), and the judging section uses the presence of the predetermined mark in the image received by the input section to determine to output the latest version of two or more documents retrieved

from the memory section which have the extracted identification number (Jeran et al: column 6, lines 14-22).

Regarding claim 30, Hisatomi et al in view of Ota further in view of Jeran et al teach all the limitations of claim 28. Further Jeran et al disclose the document management device as set forth in claim 28, wherein:

the extracting section extracts version information of the requested document from the image received by the input section (Jeran et al: column 2, lines 59-65; column 3, lines 30-35), and

the judging section uses the version information to determine to output the corresponding version of two or more documents retrieved from the memory section which have the extracted identification number (Jeran et al: column 6, lines 10-17).

Regarding claim 31, Hisatomi et al in view of Ota teach all the limitations of claim 25. Further Jeran et al disclose the document management device as set forth in claim 25, wherein:

the control section further includes an approval section for judging a presence or absence of correct approval information in the image received by the input section (Jeran et al: column 4, lines 66-67; column 5, lines 1-9;), and

when the approval section judges the absence of the correct approval information in the image received by the input section, output from the output section is prohibited (Jeran et al: column 5, lines 10-18; Hisatomi et al also prohibits print out of image file when decoding of ID (which reads on approval information) fails as shown in Figure 3, steps s126, s130-s132 wherein the print out step s129 is not executed when decode fails.).

7. Claims 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6661933 to Hisatomi et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6128102 to Ota further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5293256 to Fukushima et al further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6560704 to Dieterman et al.

Regarding claims 23 and 24, Hisatomi et al disclose a document management system, comprising at least one document management device,

wherein:

the document management device (Figure 1, reference 103) includes: a memory section for storing a document which has an identification number (Figure 1, reference 105; column 8, lines 17-32); an input section for receiving from the communications terminal device (column 12, lines 1-5) an image including the identification number of the document which has the identification number (Figure 1, reference 102; column 13, lines 55-64);

a control section comprising an extracting section for extracting the identification number from the image received by the input section (Figure 1, reference 101b; column 21, lines 24-34), a document obtaining section which uses the extracted identification number to search for and obtain from among documents in the memory section the document which has the identification number (Figure 1, reference 103). However Hisatomi et al does not disclose an input section for receiving an image including the summary information, a judging section for judging whether the extracted summary information is correct with respect to the document obtained by the document obtaining section, an output section for outputting the documents when the judging section judges

the extracted summary information to be correct, and the communications terminal device connected to the document management device.

Ota discloses an input section for receiving an image including the summary information, a judging section for judging whether the extracted summary information is correct with respect to the document obtained by the document obtaining section, an output section for outputting the documents when the judging section judges the extracted summary information to be correct (column 6, lines 22-44).

Fukushima et al disclose the communications terminal device which includes: an image reader section for reading a document image (Figure 1, reference 20); a control section having line number extractor section for extracting from the document image a plurality of line numbers of document management devices to which the communication terminal device is connectable (Fukushima et al disclose an OCR section that searches for fax numbers on cards (Figure 4, reference 67; column 12, lines 33-40));

and a line number selector section for selecting one of the line numbers from the extracted plurality of line numbers (Fukushima et al provides for selection of a number either by manual entry or by automated selector (column 14, lines 63-68; column 15, lines 1-13)); and an image transmitter section for transmitting the document image to the document management device corresponding to the selected line number (The Network Control Unit (NCU) (Figure 4, reference 78) performs the task of sending the image through a fax line (column 10, lines 54-66; column 11 , lines 19-23). Further since Hisatomi et al system has facsimile connection the document management device

and the communication terminal device can be in connection with each other (Hisatomi et al: column 12, lines 1-5).). However Fukushima et al does not disclose

a) a memory section for storing a communications cost table for communications charges per unit time for the line numbers and;

b) a line number selection wherein, the line number is selected by the line number selector section based on

i) a comparison between the extracted plurality of line numbers and a line number of the communications terminal device or

ii) communications costs determined using the communications cost table.

Dieterman et al disclose a memory section for storing a communications cost table for communications charges per unit time for the line numbers (column 4, lines 19-27) and; a line number selection wherein, the line number is selected by the line number selector section based on a comparison between the extracted plurality of line numbers and a line number of the communications terminal device (column 5, lines 15-27; column 4, lines 22-26) and based on communications costs determined using the communications cost table (column 5, lines 34-44).

Hisatomi et al, Ota, Fukushima et al, and Dieterman et al are combinable because they are in the similar problem area of document processing.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the communication device of Fukushima et al, the line number and cost table method of Dieterman et al, and the image summary inputting of Ota with

the system of Hisatomi et al to implement cost based communication method for document retrieval using image summary information.

The motivation to combine the reference is clear because using the system Fukushima et al in view of Dieterman et al would enable remote retrieval of documents in a cost effective manner and the image retrieval system of Ota provides for retrieval of files without input of keywords/titles and it provides a faster method for retrieval of files (Ota: column 1, lines 19-44).

8. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6661933 to Hisatomi et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6128102 to Ota further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5313572 to Yamamoto et al.

Regarding claim 27, Hisatomi et al in view of Ota teach all the limitations of claim 26. However Hisatomi et al in view of Ota does not disclose the document management device as set forth in claim 26, wherein the image comprises a condensed image of at least part of the requested document ().

Yamamoto et al disclose the document management device as set forth in claim 26, wherein the image comprises a condensed image of at least part of the requested document (Figure 5, Figure 6a: Figure 4b; column 5, lines 35-49; column 6, lines 1-37).

Hisatomi et al, Ota, and Jeran et al are combinable because they are in the similar problem area of document processing.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the condensed image method of image retrieval of Yamamoto

et al with the document system of Hisatomi et al in view of Ota to implement image retrieval using condensed image of a document.

The motivation to combine the reference is clear because Yamamoto et al provide for an easy and simple method for file retrieval (column 1, lines 55-68; column 2, lines 1-2).

Other Prior Art Cited

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent Application Publication Pub. No. US 2002/0010718 A1 to Miller discloses apparatus for thumbnail representation of documents.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Beniyam Menberu whose telephone number is (571) 272-7465. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM-4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kimberly Williams can be reached on (571) 272-7471. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the customer service office whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600. The group receptionist number for TC 2600 is (571) 272-2600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov/>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Patent Examiner

Beniyam Menberu

BM

2/17/2006